

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-24 are presently active, Claims 1-15 have been previously canceled without prejudice, Claims 16 and 22 are amended to address informalities. Since the amendments are merely formal in nature, they are not believed to raise a question of new matter and new issue. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 16-17, 19 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ream (U.S. Patent 6,363,228) in view of Ito (JP11-344875). Claims 18 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ream in view of Ito and further in view of Kato (JP 11-24498).

Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding grounds for rejection, because in Applicant's view, independent Claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the applied references as discussed below.

The outstanding Office Action acknowledges that Ream fails to teach transferring the unique correction data stored in the transfer unit memory to a memory of the image forming apparatus upon attachment of the transfer belt to the image forming apparatus (Office Action at page 3, lines 3-5). Instead, the outstanding Office Action relies on Ito to remedy the deficiency, stating that Ito teaches an image forming apparatus having a detachable intermediate transfer body unit 5 with a memory 25 for storing data relating to the intermediate transfer body, the data being transferred to a CPU 26 of the image forming apparatus which inherently has a memory when the intermediate transfer body is replaced with a new one (Office Action at page 3, lines 6-11).

However, Ito only describes transferring information relating *assembly conditions* of an intermediate transfer unit, stored in a memory 25 installed in the intermediate transfer unit, into a controlling unit installed in the main body of the image forming apparatus (Ito at paragraphs 0042 and 0047). That is, the CPU 26 installed in the main body reads the *information relating to the assembly conditions* from the memory 25 installed in the intermediate transfer unit, *not correction data to correct the color difference and position difference*.

Therefore, even the combination of Ream and Ito do not teach or suggest “a controller configured to ... transfer the unique correction data from the first memory to a second memory contained in the main body of the image forming apparatus” and “a correction control unit configured to correct the color difference and position difference based on the unique correction data stored in the second memory,” as recited in Claim 16.

Accordingly, independent Claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the applied references. Since Claims 17-24 are dependent directly or indirectly from Claim 16, substantially the same arguments set forth above also apply to these dependent claims. Therefore, Claims 16-24 are believed to be allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussions, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 16-24. The application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

JJK\TY:pta

I:\ATTY\TY\AMEND-RESPONSES\242294\242294 FILED AM DUE AUG 23 2007.DOC

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648